

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO.04-12429RWZ

1st Amended Complaint

March 10 2005

Plaintiff: Michael J Hyde

V.

Defendants: State of Massachusetts

State Trooper Paul Baker

State Trooper Rachael Ruthier

Clerk-Magistrate of Dedham District Court Salvatore Paterna

Dedham District Court Judge Thomas Connors

Norfolk County District Attorney William R. Keating

Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Jason Bolio

Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Max Pearlman

Norfolk County House Of Correction

Massachusetts State Police Crime Lab

Carl Selavka Director of the Ma State Police Crime Lab

Bob Pino CODIS Administrator of the Ma State Police Crime Lab

Edward A. Flynn Massachusetts Office Of Public Safety

Tom Reiley Attorney General of Massachusetts

Mitt Romney Governor of Massachusetts

NATURE OF ACTION

Defendants violated the Plaintiff's Civil Rights guaranteed by the US Constitution, Federal Laws applicable to plaintiff, abuse of process, malicious prosecution, false arrest , false imprisonment , intentional infliction of emotional distress (IIED) , negligence , discriminatory harassment , unlawful stop and search , Copyright infringement , Trade Secret violations , uploading intellectual property on a file-sharing network(s) , corruptly tampering with a witness /evidence , State Constitution ,and state law(s) .

Parties are:

The plaintiff is

(A) Michael J Hyde, musician, truck mechanic, father and a resident of Stoughton, Ma. Norfolk County in the State of Massachusetts and is a documented Citizen / natural Person of the United States.

The Defendants are assumed to be U S Citizens and living in Massachusetts are:

(B) State Trooper Paul Baker: Arresting officer, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious Prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(c) State Trooper Rachael Ruthier: Complainant, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(D) Clerk-Magistrate of Dedham District Court Salvatore Paterna: Handled much if not all of the case NO # 035cr000471, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(E) Dedham District Court Judge Thomas Connors: Handled the sentencing of case NO# 035cr000471, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(F) Norfolk County District Attorney William R. Keating: Facilitated the prosecution of case NO# 035cr000471, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(G) Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Jason Bolio: Prosecuted the case of case NO# 035cr000471, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(H) Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Max Pearlman: Prosecuted the case of case NO# 035cr000471, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious

prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511
2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec 1512 c

(I) Norfolk County House Of Correction: Held me 5/25/04, contributed to violating 1:
civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false
imprisonment, 3: abuse of process, 4: IIED, 5: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 6: USC 18 sec
1832,

(J) Massachusetts State Police Crime Lab: Installed my person (DNA), intellectual
property on a file-sharing network, that contributes to violating 1: civil
rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment,
, 3: abuse of process, 4: IIED, 5: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 6: USC 18 sec 1832,

(K) Carl Selavka Director of the Ma State Police Crime Lab: Director of operations,
contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec 1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2:
false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: abuse of process, 4: IIED, 5: USC 17 sec 101 et seq,
6: USC 18 sec 1832,

(L) Bob Pino CODIS Administrator of the Ma State Police Crime Lab: Administrator of
operations, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec
1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: abuse of
process, 4: IIED, 5: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 6: USC 18 sec 1832,

(M) Edward A. Flynn Massachusetts Office Of Public Safety: Secretary of public safety,
managing of many public agencies including the State Police and Department of
Correction, contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec
1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious
prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511
page 4

2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(N) Tom Reiley Attorney General of Massachusetts: His office investigates and prosecutes violations of state criminal law, political corruption complex criminal conspiracies, and crimes against the government of Massachusetts , contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c

(O) Mitt Romney Governor of Massachusetts: Governor: His office oversees a vast area of State Government including The Office of Public Safety , contributed to violating 1: civil rights (USC 42 sec1981,1982,1983,1985,1986,1985), 2: false arrest, false imprisonment, 3: malicious prosecution, 4: abuse of process, 5: IIED, 6: USC 17 sec 101 et seq, 7: USC 18 sec 2511 2d, 8: USC 18 sec 1832, 9: USC 18 sec1512 c.

Jurisdiction

(P)This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 28. Section 1331. Federal question**, the district courts shall have original Jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

(Q) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 42.section 1981 Equal rights under the law**

r) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 42. Section 1982. Property rights of citizens.**

(S) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 42. Section 1983. Civil action for deprivation of rights**

(T) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 42. Section 1985. Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights**

(U) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title**
page 5

42. Section 1986. Action for neglect to prevent

(V) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title**

42. Section 1988. Proceedings in vindication of civil rights

(W) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title**

18. Section 2511 Interception and disclosure of wire, oral, or

electronic communications prohibited. (2d) d) It shall not be unlawful

under this chapter for a person not acting under color of law to intercept a wire, oral, or electronic communication where such person is a party to the communication or where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception unless such communication is intercepted for the purpose of committing any criminal or tortuous act in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States.

(X) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 18. Section 1512. Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant (c)**

Whoever corruptly -

(1) alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding; or

(2) otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so,

shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

(Y) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 18. Section 1832. Theft of trade secrets (a)** Whoever, with intent to convert a trade secret, that is

related to or included in a product that is produced for or placed in interstate or foreign commerce, to the economic benefit of anyone other than the owner thereof, and intending or knowing that the offense will, injure any owner of that trade secret, knowingly (1) steals, or without authorization appropriates, takes, carries away, or conceals, or by fraud, artifice, or deception obtains such information;

(2) without authorization copies, duplicates, sketches, draws, photographs, downloads, uploads, alters, destroys, photocopies, replicates, transmits, delivers, sends, mails, communicates, or conveys such information;

(3) receives, buys, or possesses such information, knowing the same to have been stolen or appropriated, obtained, or converted without authorization;

(4) attempts to commit any offense described in paragraphs (1) through (3); or

(5) conspires with one or more other persons to commit any offense described in paragraphs (1) through (3), and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, shall, except as provided in subsection (b), be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both. (b) Any organization that commits any offense described in subsection (a) shall be fined not more than \$5,000,000.

(Z) This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to **USC Title 17. section 101 et seq . Featuring section 504. Remedies for infringement: Damages and profits** (c2) In a case where the copyright owner sustains the burden of proving, and the court finds, that infringement was committed willfully, the court in its discretion may

increase the award of statutory damages to a sum of not more than \$150,000.

FACTS

1 On February 15 2003, State Trooper Paul Baker of the Framingham State Police pulled me over on a Federally funded interstate highway 128 north based on the color of my license plate. At the stop the officer I recall had his weapon drawn and shouted obscenities at me and demanded me to leave my car. I was driving a sports car and had long hair in which the officer believed and profiled me as a "drug dealer". Without charging me with a crime, Baker placed me in cuffs and placed me under arrest. Its important to note, Baker clamed he was in fear for his safety but never called for back-up to support his claim As I recall, I was never read or explained of my rights during my entire exposure to Baker.

2 Baker entered my vehicle without permission and without a warrant. He placed me in cuffs citing the need for his safety. Although Baker was being verbally abusive, I complied with his demands as I was in fear for my life as this officer had his gun already drawn at me. Baker was looking all over my car in almost all the compartments and tearing up some areas of my car. Baker claimed he found a voice-activated tape recorder under steering compartment. As Baker emerged from my car, shut the recorder off and he stated clearly and with sadistic tone said "you can get hurt for this ". It was my belief that this recorder being voice-activated may have started up.

3 I must state that under the circumstances given that I had given no provocation such as any confrontational movement or speech on my part, and with a gun drawn on me from the beginning of this, I was in a state of fear and was not thinking about anything

else but this belligerent officer shooting me. As I was charged with the state statute ch 272 sec 99, the state wiretap statute, I recall that I told him I was compliant with the Federal Statute, Title 18 Sec 2511, under exemption 2D. Baker used an explicative to make me shut up and said that I didn't have his permission to record him even in public. I said, the law that your charging me with never states or infers that I need permission to record. I'd bet your voice is not on the tape I stated. More explicatives from Baker. I stated that this would be a documentary, diary or at least a sound recording protected by Title 17. Baker forced me into the car by that I mean he made my head hit the roof of this police car.

4 As the tow truck showed up, I asked him to shut my car off, Baker never asked me to shut the car off and was on this whole time. As baker entered his cruiser, he stated it's in my interest to shut up if you know what's good for you. I told him that you are wrong on so many levels constitutionally and legally. I said that if you shut off the recorder, then you edited the tape, which is in violation of this law. Your obstructing justice. He stated "It's your word against mine". I said what happened is on the tape. Baker said you'd never hear or see it again. You have to turn the evidence over to me as stated in the state statute. Baker said are you explicative, you'll be up against the DA, the court, and me. You're in violation of article 5 and 12 of the state constitution also. You should shut the explicative up now Baker said. You're violating the US constitution also pertaining to the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, and 14th Amendments just to name a few. I was taken to the station a photo was taken of me; I was given a citation because of the color of my plates, an arraignment docket and later released at a cost of \$500.00 bail. My wife was also demanded to produce a license before they would accept the bail money.

5 At my arraignment in Dedham District Court, I applied for a court appointed attorney and was denied this option. Due to the complex violations of this action taken against me, the State of Massachusetts had an overwhelming advantage financially over me and as well as man-power that I could not compete with. Assistant DA Max Pearlman stated to me you need an attorney in the hallway after the court session. I then stated to Pearlman to furnish me with the evidence pursuant to MGL ch 272 sec 99. Well you recorded the officer without his permission and need an attorney for that. I said you're incorrect, the law never mentions nor infers permission ever in this statute and this court won't provide me an attorney. This statute used this way violates your State and Federal Constitution as well as Federal law and stated to Pearlman the same as I did with Baker.

6 I had to pay an attorney \$3500.00 for this infringement of my Civil Rights and Copy writes violated by the state. At 10/23/03, the pretrial hearing, Baker admitted to multiple counts of copy write infringement and doing this investigation of my intellectual property without a warrant. Baker made up testimony that was vastly different from the actual stop. When Baker, under oath was asked if he had the recorder with him he stated he did not and also stated he stopped the recorder. After the pretrial, I went down to the DA's office at Dedham District Court to assistant DA Jason Bolio to point out the law I was charged with. I stated that Baker didn't know the law ch 272 sec 99 that by shutting the recorder off he has altered the evidence criminally under the same law which carries a penalty up to 2 ½ years. I stated the recorder as anyone knows would run out of power or tape and stop on its own. Bolio stated he wont talk to me. I said I'm here to file a complaint within the statute against Baker. I then stated I need the evidence that should have been given at me arraignment. Bolio who is paid by the taxpayer insisted I leave

now

7 On May 7th, 2003, I had a Clerk-magistrate hearing on the plate violation in which Rachael Routhier took the place of Baker. It should be noted that Routhier was the complainant of this wiretap case and routinely kept the tape in her possession. It's not a stretch to assume that as the complainant she has also listened to my documentary without a warrant and is in violation of US Code Title 17. Routhier was asked in court if any audio or video devices were in operation at the hands of her fellow officers. Her statement was that due to the fiscal restraints each patrol car couldn't be fitted with audio video surveillance. I asked again did Baker's car have any such devices. She said there was no recording made from Baker or his car. Its also important to note that the courtroom states recording in progress. At this hearing, Magistrate O'Neil dismissed the plate violation.

8 On May 25th, 2004, had an emergence doctor's appointment that for what ever reason landed on a date that neither my attorney nor the court informed me of. As I left my appointment and scheduled a medical operation, my attorney at around 2 in the afternoon tells me to show up in court. At the court they issued me a warrant then got me, without my request, a public defender who new nothing about the case. Judge Wexler sent me to the Norfolk County House of Correction until 11 pm At that facility two photos and twenty images of my finger prints were taken. I stated that this is a violation of copyright law. They said I couldn't leave without these conditions being met. Of the 21 [twenty one] days I was in and out of this court for this charge; I was never late or missed a date that I was told to show for.

9 On November 24th, 2004, in a hearing in front of Judge Connors I was under
page 11

extreme duress as DA Keating was pushing for jail time, I was forced with the potential threat of losing my freedom to agree to probation of which the Judge knew I was coerced by the threats of the prosecution. The prosecution, as one part of the plea recommended a psychological evaluation in which Connors concurred with. What's interesting about this is if there was any question of my mental faculties, shouldn't I have been evaluated prior to any hearings or trial dates? It seems obvious that this condition was to add insult to injury at my expense and a clear intent to cruel and unusual punishment. I had 2 visits with a psychologist Neil Cronin at a cost of almost \$200.00. Connors also removed the dismissal of the plate violation ordered by Magistrate O'Neil and reinstated it. What was disturbing also about Connors was he stated, "imagine cloning 12 Michael Hyde's" then ordered my DNA to be submitted to the state. The prosecution demanded that this alleged recording be destroyed. Connors ordered it. I stated to Connors that this is a violation of the 1st Amendment and also US Code Title 17 the Copyright statute. This was destruction of evidence that only state officials claimed they heard and I never got to examine this alleged wiretap. Due process of the law was never in existence in this case. I can legally reopen this case but this tape, which can reveal the States case was filled with lies, which falls in the category of deformation of character, was destroyed upon the State officials orders. What's more is that the officers voice was never on this tape and the charge of attempted wiretap was also added as a back up to Bakers complaint.

10 By using my property with out my permission, and by forcing myself, the author, to pay a fine more then \$2400 for possessing speech protected by the 1st Amendment and then destroying copy write protected material, there goal of censorship was achieved at
page 12

the additional expense of Federal Law, the US Constitution, and International Law. I lost twenty days of work, dealt with the personal stress this case has put on the people around me. Due to the terms of my probation, I will lose about another 24 days due to this action committed against me by the State of Massachusetts.

11 I was ordered to set a date for the DNA test. A person, who stated his name was Steve, demanded my ssn or this state agency would refuse to admit me. On February 18th, 2005, I was force to turn over 9 DNA blood samples and 2 fingerprints. This was another day from work. I told this agency that this also a violation of Constitutional merit along with Patent and copyright infringement, and a violation of Trade Secrets.

12 Around June 2003 I had called The State House, Attorneys Office, Office of Public safety to name a few. I told them what was happening and wanted this to stop. These agencies didn't seem to care about Constitutional violations committed against me. I sent certified letters as to the cost of the rights to use my properties see attached figures 1-3. I stated to them that if they admit fault I would not broaden my legal approach. That meaning Federal Court . The State of Massachusetts, Dedham District Court, and State Police have used my property in defiance of the conditions listed in my certified letters sent to them. This property and material is protected be the US Constitution, Copyright Law, Patent Law, Trade Secrets as well as International Law. My Civil Rights as well as the R.I.C.O statute is also violated by the State illegal actions. To this date the State has refused to give me back my documentary, { A day in the life Michael J Hyde}

13 It should be noted that the State has used discriminatory practice against me. Not only was I pulled over because of color, but not a single DA or Attorney General has filed a wiretap against anyone else in the history of the USA for

documenting State Government actions in open public. I'm charged with the same crime Corporate America, in the form of the record and movie industry, performs when they use a sophisticated monitoring/ recording device known by contemporary terms as a computer the very definition of a wiretap .Not a single DA, Attorney General, police or any other State agency has done a single thing to curve Corporate America's active policy of conducting illegal wiretaps while intruding into Tax-paying American homes.

Although my rights were never read to me as necessary by law, Baker a 7+ year veteran should have known that anything he said would be used against him and that he had a right to an attorney .He discards those rights but complains that he was recorded without his permission and play the part of a victim to which I am labeled a felon due to his unconstitutional actions. Massachusetts has utilized my property without my consent, which violates Copyright Laws as well as my Civil Rights.

14 The 1st Amendment guarantees freedom of speech, to be free of censorship and prosecution of unpopular speech, freedom of the press, and the right to petition the government .I was charged with having possessed a tape that contained, not a casual conversation that a person can chose to maintain or stop, but a brutal interrogation performed by Baker with his gun then with restraints. Add to this that even if I had only 1 plate on the rear of my car, it was still able to perform the same function as cars given a green plate. This is to say that drivers issued red plates are denied the ability to express themselves such as in the installation of a vanity plate in the front as an example that drivers with a green plate can display. And if the States argument is that the 2 plates are a safety concern, then all cars at the same time should have to submit equally .The 2nd Amendment was violated because I was denied the right to bear arms, {the Constitution

never states guns as to not limit the scope and intent of this amendment}, as in this case to bring the whole truth as thru the use of an FCC regulated device as an example. The concept of using a tape recorder as a tool for self-defense in court seems the most logical application given the fact that the same story is told every time the recorder is activated. Another part of the 2nd Amendment is to maintain a "well regulated militia" which would mean the people empowered with the truth about what goes on during government encounters to motivate people to heighten their social awareness for the common good of America.

15 My 4th Amendment right was violated the moment the officer entered my car without a warrant and or with out probable cause. Baker didn't have a warrant to uses, alter, or take my property. Baker used profiling as a method to justify who he removes from a car. He saw long hair, a sports car and the equation equaled drugs. He draws a gun and handcuffs me. The State has made a demand for my DNA to which I was forced to produce under the threat of jail time if I refused. Using my DNA in a database violates the need for a warrant to search a person or their effects. In effect any time there is a crime in which DNA is sampled, I am directly involved in this warrentless search

16 The 5th Amendment was infringed due to the fact that the moment play was pressed; my voice became a witness against myself. This property was taken for public use by the State. I had sent letters {see figures 1-3} to various State agencies addressing this issue. I have not been compensated for my materials to which the State was told in advance of the conditions to use such items. By taking a DNA sample, I am forced to testify against myself and Due process is further eroded away.

17 The 6th Amendment was violated because the witness here was a tape and the
page 15

mere existence of the witness subjected me to criminal State law. The State denied me this witness from my arraignment on. And finally, with the recommendation on the DA and the order of Judge Connors, they killed this witness.

18 The 8th Amendment, cruel and unusual punishment. No one else has ever charged and convicted of monitoring / recording a government official in open public. Not even the Record and Movie Industry has been charged for their illegal activities of wiretap. This conviction compels me to loose certain Constitutional rights and employment positions due to an act that was protected under Federal Law and the US Constitution. I have to turn over my DNA for a non-violent so called State crime that is discriminately applied and labeled a felony. This would be cruel and unusual punishment when compared to violent crimes against another person or even kids in which the offence is considered a misdemeanor.

19 The 13th Amendment sec 1 is violated when my DNA, which is I under proper cell division, is held under involuntary servitude or as a slave to be utilized by the government.

20 The 14th Amendment Right was unconstitutionally taken from me when the State law was is contrast to Title 18 sec 2511 under exemption 2d, copyright law, Trade secret Law, Patent Law. I was denied equal protection under the State law, Due process, and deprived of property {my tape, fingerprints, DNA}.

Count I USC Title

42.section 1981 Equal rights under the law

21 Defendants, State Trooper Paul Baker, State Trooper Rachael Ruthier,
Clerk-Magistrate of Dedham District Court Salvatore Paterna, Dedham District Court

Judge Thomas Connors, Norfolk County District Attorney William R. Keating, Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Jason Bolio, Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Max Pearlman, Edward A. Flynn Massachusetts Office Of Public Safety, Tom Reiley Attorney General of Massachusetts, and Mitt Romney Governor of Massachusetts, had to know that the application of MGL ch 272 sec 99 against the Plaintiff was a violation of equal protection under the law.

22 A rational person would find the defendants application under the MGL ch 272 sec 99 outrageous. Sighting the Comm. V. Gerard Rotunda 3rd, Comm. V. David Mastriano and Corporate America in the form of the Recording and Movie Industry V. file shares in Massachusetts . All have violated the wiretap statute according to the Defendants assertions but only charge the Plaintiff . This is selective enforcement and utilized against people the Defendants don't like . It also goes against US Code Title 18 Sec. 2511 (2d) It shall not be unlawful under this chapter for a person not acting under color of law to intercept a wire, oral, or electronic communication where such person is a party to the communication or where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception unless such communication is intercepted for the purpose of committing any criminal or tortuous act in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States.

23 Example of when Federal Laws overtakes State Laws The case is Gonzales v. Raich, case no. 03-1454. US Supreme ruled even if States legalize marijuana, It's still illegal under the laws of the land . So to would be the State wiretap law V. Federal wiretap Statute.

COUNT II

USC Title 42. Section 1982. Property rights of citizens.

24 The Defendants, State Trooper Paul Baker, State Trooper Rachael Ruthier, Clerk-Magistrate of Dedham District Court Salvatore Paterna,

Dedham District Court Judge Thomas Connors, Norfolk County District Attorney William R. Keating, Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Jason Bolio, Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Max Pearlman, Edward A. Flynn Massachusetts Office Of Public Safety, Tom Reiley Attorney General of Massachusetts, and Mitt Romney Governor of Massachusetts, as to property rights, the recording although the state declared an illegal wiretap pursuant to MGL ch 272 sec 99 , it was still property protected by the 1st Amendment . The US Supreme Court decision in Bartnicki v. Vopper 532 U.S. 514 (2001) Docket Number: 99-1687 affirmed that by a decision of 6 to 3 in favor of the 1st Amendment.

25 That said, my recording of "A day in the life of Michael J Hyde Feb 15, 2003" a documentary created on Route 128 North , on a Federally funded Interstate High Way , cant be even remotely considered a private matter of which a wiretap would invade or intercept for that matter. Not only did the US Constitution protect this but also it was protected by US CODE TITLE 17 as intellectual property .

26 The recorder in question, (Olympus Pearlcor S700 cassette recorder) is FCC regulated and sent across US Highways a sold everywhere shopping malls exist.

27 The Plaintiff sent out at least 3 different notices to several State Agencies, Edward A. Flynn Massachusetts Office Of Public Safety, Tom Reiley Attorney General of Massachusetts, and Mitt Romney Governor of Massachusetts, just to present a few.

28 The notices are listed as ATTENTION (figure 1), WARNING (figure 2), WARNING NOTICE (figure 3). Listed below are representations the State should have on file.

29

ATTENTION

Figure 1

I, Michael J Hyde, am writing this formal letter to let you know that your state agencies have in their possession an office device (voice activated recorder) that is located at the Framingham State Police station. This device is in use at this state agency without compensation to the alleged owner Michael J Hyde. This exercise of the State without compensation is in violation of State Constitution (Article 1, 12 and 14) and United States Constitution (4th and 5th) Amendments just to name a few.

The recorder has been in the states possession since February 15, 2003 and is built up late fees and interest charges. As of now being the date September 4, 2004, the total charges are \$5550.00 US dollars. This breaks down to \$7.50 a day at 566 days plus \$20 overdue charges per month (19 months) plus 20% interest. Be aware that the daily rental fee will increase September 13th to \$10.50 daily with the monthly overdue charges to \$25.00 and interest charges to be set to 21.5%.

It is imperative that this situation receives closure as to alleviate a complex situation from expanding to other legal and vastly more costly avenues. Please feel free to contact me at (home 781 341 4299), (work 617 697 8893) or write to Michael J Hyde at 148 Brickel Rd, Stoughton, MA, 02072

This Attention Letter is intellectual property of Michael J Hyde and is protected by US Code Title 17 and other international treaties relating to intellectual property and is not to be copied or reproduced unless specified by Michael J Hyde.

Thank you for your attention, Michael J Hyde.

30

WARNING

Figure 2

The use of any and all forms of intellectual property relating to Michael J Hyde is protected under Federal and International Law. Any use of this property without prior consent is in violation of United States Code Title 17 and the Berne Copyright Treaty. This warning is not designed to give amnesty to any entities that has violated these laws and others that are not listed here, this is merely a formal notice letting you know what can happen. It is up to the person(s) or entities that wish to utilize this property to contact its creator, Michael J Hyde. Because of the nature of how this property was taken without permission and with a firearm drawn on it's creator on a Federally funded Interstate Highway, other laws may apply including the RICO STATUTE.

Intellectual property of Michael J Hyde includes any and all representations of his images, sounds, thoughts weather past, present and future. Images include photos, video, medical films, tattoos, DNA, visual costumes or characters, fingerprints, staged performances, in essence all visual data that is identified as Michael J Hyde. Sounds

include devices used to make a musical performance and or sound recording, vocal recordings for music, dialog to a live performance, any character created sonically or vocally, documentaries such as A Day In The Life OF Michael J Hyde, in essence all sounds identified as that of Michael J Hyde. Thoughts include all creative concepts abstract and or concrete that are fixed to a tangible format such as a photo, micro cassette, compact disc, electronic storage device, etc.

Michael J Hyde reserves all rights to all forms of intellectual property created by Michael J Hyde unless otherwise specified in writing. Unless otherwise specified to use, copy, or have anything to do with this property be aware that to use this intellectual property, it has a value affixed to it of \$230,000,000 (two hundred thirty million U S dollars) However if this intellectual property is used prior to Michael J Hyde receiving the payment specified with intent to harm and causes injury to Michael J Hyde such as physical, mental, legal or any other detrimental harm to Michael J Hyde, the affixed value will now be \$230,000,000,000 (two hundred thirty billion U S dollars). Michael J Hyde has the right to employ the use of any Federal or International laws that pertain to recovering damages to commercial value of any and all intellectual property. Also Michael J Hyde has the right to incorporate any foreign entities and or persons to file suit in foreign courts including Europe on his behalf. Please note, the U S Supreme has allowed a lawsuit to be filed in U S District Court in the case of Austria v Altmann which deals with intellectual property stated over \$100 million dollars. This legal road is a two way street in which many countries may want to travel and the intellectual property of Michael J Hyde may be a fine vehicle for Europe to travel on.

If the cost of the property seems expensive in excess in which you are willing to spend, then it is suggested that you cease and desist from use and possession of this property. Furthermore the application may seem selective but it is not intended that way and is no excuse to violate copyright laws that protect the property of Michael J Hyde.

This Warning Letter is intellectual property of Michael J Hyde and is not to be copied or reproduced without prier consent of Michael J Hyde. Thank you for your attention in this matter as I'm sure that if you wish to contact Michael J Hyde feel free to ask any questions at address 148 Brickel Rd Stoughton Ma 02072 or call phone # 1- 781 341- 4299. Thank You. Mike Hyde.

31

WARNING NOTICE

FIGURE 3

Any and all persons and or entities that wish to use my services or products must pay up front. This includes all DNA, photographs, fingerprints, and or any related documentation related to Michael J Hyde. This notice is a formal warning that cannot be signed away unless payment is received in full to Michael J Hyde. The State of Massachusetts and persons acting as its officers and or employees have stated a demand for my DNA, finger prints and other products of Michael J Hyde as a State Court order that seem to be in violation of State law, the State Constitution, Federal Law, the US Constitution and International Law.

Due to the fact that Michael J Hyde is a manufacturing plant of his DNA,

fingerprints, and other created identifiable concepts and or products of Michael J Hyde, this would be a violation of Patient Law as well as a violation of TRADE SECRETS. Entities that are employed by the State and use my tax dollars as payment are my employees and by my rights as the legal guardian of myself, shall not receive freely any products, DNA. Any disclosure forced by the State of Massachusetts would be viewed as a violation of Patent infringement and a violation of TRADE SECRETS in Federal Court and other Courts across the globe.

The State Court has made a troubling demand for my products. By demanding my DNA and or finger prints, my 4th, 5th, and 13th US Constitutional Amendments to name just a few are violated. The State has demanded that I, against my freewill and under duress due to a State law that violates other Federal and International laws as well as the State and Federal Constitutional provisions, I must submit a DNA sample to the State Government of Massachusetts by FEB 18, 2005. As for property taken for public use, I see compensation to the amount of \$1,000,000,000 [one billion US dollars] before FEB 18, 2005 or \$1,000,000,000,000 [one trillion US dollars] after FEB 18, 2005. This figure is doubled due to the violation of the TRADE SECRETS and Patent Law violations. This figure can be negotiated but its up to the State of Massachusetts to call out to me with no direct or indirect threats to myself or finances, incarceration or any other State retaliatory activities. Any agreement that are and will be signed that do not benefit Michael J Hyde and or designed to protect the State from any legal, Constitutional, or financial responsibility shall be deemed as signed under duress and shall not be considered legally binding.

Thank you for your time in this matter. I do hope to here from you in the near future, before Feb 18, 2005. Contact me at 148 Brickel Rd, Stoughton, MA 02072 or call at 781-341-4299. Thank you. Michael J Hyde.

32 For the purpose of physical example, I've presented the documents at the end of this presentation also.

33 As to these notices and works affixed to a tangible medium, there is no way a person with common sense with diligence would not come to rational conclusion that would be to think 1, this tape is protected by the US Constitution intellectual property rights 2, the notices should concern me or my office or 3, contact the proprietor in these notices.

34 As it seems ether out of spite or the concept of being above the law, the State decided to install a censorship policy after using the tape themselves then destroy the Plaintiffs protected works. As to DNA, photos, finger prints there also property of the Plaintiff

that was take without payment and under duress of loss of liberty , a Constitutional Right.

COUNT III

USC Title

42. Section 1983. Civil action for deprivation of rights

35 All Defendents were guilty of this action.

36 Baker pulled the Plaintiff's car over based on color of the license plate ,then pulled his gun focused on the plaintiff ,ordered the Plaintiff out and placed him in handcuffs . At this point false arrest and false imprisonment took place . The Plaintiff was never read his rights. At no time was they're any reasonable cause to suspect any illegal or dangerous activity was happening it appears the Plaintiff fit a profile. Sports car, long hair equals drug dealer. Baker entered into the vehicle apparently looking for drugs . He never had a warrant but looking inside my vehicle Baker claimed he found a voice-activated recorder shut it off then walked over to me and stated in a threatening manner "You can get hurt for this" and aggressively forced me in the police car. By charging me he also violated my 1st Amendment Rights to freedom of speech and expression of which I was arrested for . My recorder was taken and examined without a warrant. Even if he got a warrant, it still would have a violation of my 5th Amendment Right(s) ,(self incrimination) and public use of personal property without just compensation , (emanate domain). Playing that tape constituted an

illegal search and seizure for which an officer would have to secure and present probable cause before a judge of sound reasoning would issue one. This would also be abuse of process and malicious prosecution with his blatant disregard for the US Constitution.

37 State Trooper Rachael Ruthier was listed as the complainant which a person could only reasonably deduct that she listened the tape at least once which would violate my 1st, 4th, 5th and 14th (due process of the laws). One could reason that Ruthier also acted out of malice due to the fact that others are not prosecuted under this law, Comm. V. Gerard Rotunda 3rd, Comm. V. David Mastriano and Corporate America in the form of the Recording and Movie Industry V. file shares in Massachusetts.

38 Clerk-Magistrate of Dedham District Court Salvatore Paterna in effect helped in part by facilitating the courtroom operations at my arraignment and not allowing me a court-appointed attorney or making positive that I have a copy of the tape pursuant to MGL ch 272 sec 99. A rational person would come to conclusion to commence these proceedings would be a violation of due process.

39 Dedham District Court Judge Thomas Connors would have had to know that these proceedings were a clear violation of my Civil Rights and contradicted Federal laws. He knew I was never issued a copy of the tape, which would be a clear violation of Due Process. He then orders the tape destroyed violating the protection of free speech of which the US Constitution protected the tape under and preventing the Plaintiff petitioning the Government with proof of a grievance that would be on that recording.

40 Norfolk County District Attorney William R. Keating,

Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Jason Bolio, and Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Max Pearlman would cause a rational person of integrity to exclaim “This is outrageous “. It probably would be a stretch to see a case that contained more Civil Rights violations, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, criminal negligence, and intentional infliction of emotional distress (IIED), for such a victimless crime .

41 This case maybe the best example of all to award Exemplary Damages especially for reckless conduct that seemed to go beyond conduct that was corrupt and contemptuous.

42 Pearlman , Bolio ,and Keating upon seeing the complaint set forth by the state police should have concluded that this case is in clear violation of ,MGLch 272 sec 99 (C 2) .

Editing of tape recordings in judicial proceeding prohibited.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section any person who willfully edits, alters or tampers with any tape, transcription or recording of oral or wire communications by any means, or attempts to edit, alter or tamper with any tape, transcription or recording of oral or wire communications by any means with the intent to present in any judicial proceeding or proceeding under oath, or who presents such recording or permits such recording to be presented in any judicial proceeding or proceeding under oath, without fully indicating the nature of the changes made in the original state of the recording, shall be fined not more than ten thousand dollars or imprisoned in the state prison for not more than five years or imprisoned in a jail or house of correction for not more than two years or both so fined and given one such imprisonment .

43 Defendants knew here that when the officer stopped the tape, the integrity of the tape was compromised.

44 At Plaintiff's arraignment, the prosecution refused to supply a copy of the tape of this alleged wiretap pursuant to MGL ch 272 sec 99 O. **Introduction of evidence.**

1. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section or any order issued pursuant thereto, in any criminal trial where the commonwealth intends to offer in evidence any portions of the contents of any interception or any evidence derived there from the defendant shall be served with a complete copy of each document and item which make up each application, renewal application, warrant, renewal order, and return pursuant to which the information was obtained, except that he shall be furnished a copy of any recording instead of the original. The service must be made at the arraignment of the defendant.

45 These prosecutors by applying these charges violated their State Constitution set forth in Article V. All power residing originally in the people, and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government, vested with authority, whether legislative, executive, or judicial, are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them.

46 Article XII. No subject shall be held to answer for any crimes or offence, until the same is fully and plainly, substantially and formally, described to him; or be compelled to accuse, or furnish evidence against himself. And every subject shall have a right to produce all proofs, that may be favorable to him; to meet the witnesses against him face to face, and to be fully heard in his defense by himself, or his counsel, at his election. And no subject shall be arrested,

imprisoned, despoiled, or deprived of his

property, immunities, or privileges, put out of the protection of the law, exiled, or

deprived of his life, liberty, or estate, but by

the judgment of his peers, or the law of the land .

47 As to Article 5, this is to mean accountability of state officials at all times of which this recording allegedly reflected.

48 As to Article 12, this is to mean a person could furnish evidence such as a recording to the contrary of a complaint and vindicate the accused.

49 In addition to these examples denied the Plaintiff, Federal Laws and the US

Constitution were also denied to the Plaintiff wrongly such as the 1st , 2nd ,4th ,5th ,8th , 13th , and 14th Amendment rights.

50 At all times the Plaintiff should have been aloud all the immunities or reduced

penalties other parties are afforded such as Comm. V. Gerard Rotunda 3rd (meter maid held down her radio call button so others could eavesdrop on the conversation) .Comm.

V. Mastriano (motorist taped a cop to which was used in court against the cop). Comm.

V. Yianacopulus (this woman beat an 11 year-old at a little league baseball game, this

Is not a felony .Her punishment, watch a sports video and write an essay. Comm. V

David Smith (admitted to repeatedly molesting a girl under 14 got a plea deal to keep his pension and not register as a sex offender.).

51 The Record and Movie Industry claiming infringement against the people of

Massachusetts (this industry while claiming infringement, commits crimes against the

people of Massachusetts in the form of trespassing , invasion of privacy , extortion , and

illegal wiretap pursuant to MGL ch 272 sec 99).

52 At sentencing for this felony conviction, they demanded \$65.00 monthly for 2 years , DNA samples with fingerprints, probation every month for 2 years , psychological exam , and destroyed my tape that was protected by USC 17 , the 1st Amendment as well as many other Constitutional provisions ,see US Supreme Court decision Bartnicki v.

Vopper 532 U.S. 514 (2001) Docket Number: 99-1687

53 Again the Plaintiff reiterates, it probably would be a stretch to see a case that contained more Civil Rights violations, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, criminal negligence, and intentional infliction of emotional distress (IIED), for such a victimless crime . This case maybe the best example of all to award Exemplary Damages especially for reckless conduct that seemed to go beyond conduct that was corrupt and contemptuous.

54 As to Edward A. Flynn Massachusetts Office Of Public Safety, Tom Reiley Attorney General of Massachusetts, and Mitt Romney Governor of Massachusetts, all offices had received the 3 letters (figs 1-3) in which money was featured for the use of my property for which Plaintiff had received nothing as of yet .By not acting , they have condoned the actions of the other defendants which amounts to a deprivation of rights pursuant to 42 USC sec 1983.

55 As to Norfolk County House Of Correction Massachusetts State Police Crime Lab, Carl Selavka Director of the Ma State Police Crime Lab, Bob Pino CODIS Administrator of the Ma State Police Crime Lab, these entities in there official capacities and mechanisms have the Plaintiff's property on a file-sharing

network(s) such as DNA , fingerprints , and photos that are at all times protected by the US Constitution's 1st, 4th, 5th, and 14th Amendments .

56 Federal laws were also violated relating to intellectual property rights by using the Plaintiff's property without permission such as Trade Secret and Copyright Laws.

COUNT IV

USC Title

42 section 1985. Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights

57 All defendants have performed routines that when put together either by direct involvement and or lack of action , demonstrate a system that routinely violates Civil Rights and is in great need of repair. From systematic destruction of evidence to outright defiance to the US Constitution ,Federal Laws and the common well-being that law and order is to promote to the people of the United States .

58 A person of reasonable judgment would have no other conclusion that, given the scope of the actions of all the defendants in this wiretap case, that this is an outrage of justice or lack of .

59 As far as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is concerned, it appears that reckless action by state officials as displayed in this case of wiretap that was designed to protect state government from accountability , can only create an environment that could only propagate civil rights conspiracies .

60 The actions of the defendants scream for Exemplary Damages.

COUNT V

USC Title

42 section 1986. Action for neglect to prevent

61 All defendants listed in all counts could and should be liable for Exemplary Damages as to prevent this action from ever happening again to anyone else. There should also be a payment to the people of Massachusetts in the form of repairing a defective mechanism that is hurting Americans.

62 This would be to repair the state statute MGL ch 272 sec 99 D 1 Exemptions to reflect
US Code Title 18 sec 2511 exemption 2d

It shall not be
unlawful under this chapter for a person not acting under
color of law to intercept a wire, oral, or electronic
communication where such person is a party to the
communication or where one of the parties to the
communication has given prior consent to such interception
unless such communication is intercepted for the purpose of
committing any criminal or tortuous act in violation of the
Constitution or laws of the United States.

COUNT VI

USC Title

42 section 1988. Proceeding in vindication of civil rights

63 If it is so that attorneys litigate in a court of law and take the side of the defense or plaintiff , then members representing themselves should be compensated the same.

Plaintiff would want to be compensated by the defense in attorney's fees commensurate to a reasonable monetary figure suggested by the US Courts .

COUNT VII

USC Title

18 section 2511. Interception and disclosure of wire, oral, or electronic communications prohibited

64 Defendants case against me was based in defiance against the Federal wiretap statute. This statute under Exemptions 2d was guaranteed to me as the law of the land. This law seems to conform to the US Constitution and should remain in operation even in Massachusetts.

65 The charges of MGL ch272 sec 99 against the Plaintiff is in sharp contrast and should be remove from Plaintiff outright

COUNT VIII

USC Title

18 section 1512. Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant

66 The defendants State Trooper Paul Baker State ,Trooper Rachael Ruthier,

Clerk-Magistrate of Dedham District Court Salvatore Paterna,

Dedham District Court Judge Thomas Connors, Norfolk County District Attorney William R. Keating ,Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Jason Bolio ,and Norfolk County Assistant District Attorney Max Pearlman appeared to work in concert to destroy this evidence even though it was protected under the US Constitution and Federal Law.

67 This is supported by the 1st, 5th, 14th Amendments also affirmed by the US Supreme Court The 6-to-3 decision came in the joined cases of *Bartnicki v. Vopper* (No. 99-1687) and *United States v. Vopper* (No. 99-1728).68 This tape is also protected by USC Title18 section 2511 and USC Title 17 .

68 There was no justification corruptly alter or destroy this evidence and as such it scream for Exemplary Damages .

COUNT IX

USC Title

18 section 1832. **Theft of trade secrets**

69 All defendants were involved and performed activities that ended up with my finger prints and DNA on a file sharing network . The extent is unknown because this file sharing network transmits my sensitive materials over many states.

70 Because of the scope of this violation, the Plaintiff requests a probe into the amount of times the Plaintiff's DNA and fingerprints were transmitted over this file-sharing network . each use of these trade secrets carries a

\$5,000,000 penalty pursuant to USC 18 sec 1832 .The defendants were willful in this violation and so the Plaintiff also seeks Exemplary Damages for these infringements.

COUNT X

USC Title

17 section 101 et seq. Copyright infringement

71 All defendants were willful in their activities of contributory copyright infringement relating to the Plaintiff's intellectual property. All parties in the form of constitutional officers were sent letters about the use of said property , (see figs 1-3).

72 The documentary tape, (A day in the life of Michael J Hyde Feb 15, 2003) was protected by title 17 which subsists the moment sound and or spoken word is affixed to a tangible form. At no time did the defendants have permission nor did they try to ascertain it.

73 Although the state had possession of this documentary and with malice, used it against the Plaintiff ,they had no initial right nor later rights to this tape. The tape was taken from the Plaintiff at gunpoint on a Federally funded Interstate Highway (128 North) As of Nov 24 , 2004 , the state police , prosecutors , and Dedham District Court staff set out to destroy the Plaintiff's intellectual property.

74 As to Plaintiff's photos, DNA, and fingerprints, the same holds true as to the afore mentioned except the state entered them into a file sharing network of which allows anyone to facilitate this infringement(s) .

75 see US Supreme court MGM.v.Grokster file-sharing network can be sued for copyright infringement .

76 Willful violations 17 USC section 504. Remedies for infringement: Damages and profits

(a)

In general. Except as otherwise provided by this title, an infringer of copyright is liable for either-- (1)

the copyright owner's actual damages and any additional profits of the infringer, as provided by subsection (b); or

(2)

statutory damages, as provided by subsection (c).

(b)

Actual damages and profits. The copyright owner is entitled to recover the actual damages suffered by him or her as a result of the infringement, and any profits of the infringer that are attributable to the infringement and are not taken into account in computing the actual damages. In establishing the infringer's profits, the copyright owner is required to present proof only of the infringer's gross revenue, and the infringer is required to prove his or her deductible expenses and the elements of profit attributable to factors other than the copyrighted work.

(c)

Statutory damages. (1)

Except as provided by clause (2) of this subsection, the copyright owner may elect, at any time before final judgment is rendered, to recover, instead of actual damages and profits, an award of statutory damages for all infringements involved in the action, with respect to any one work, for which any one infringer is liable individually, or for which any two or more infringers are liable jointly and severally, in a sum of not less than \$ 750 or more than \$ 30,000 as the court considers just. For the purposes of this subsection, all the parts of a compilation or derivative work constitute one work.

(2)

In a case where the copyright owner sustains the burden of proving, and the court finds, that infringement was committed willfully, the court in its discretion may increase the award of statutory damages to a sum of not more than \$ 150,000. In a case where the infringer sustains the burden of proving, and the court finds, that such infringer was not aware and had no reason to believe that his or her acts constituted an infringement of copyright, the court in its discretion may reduce the award of statutory damages to a sum of not less than \$ 200. The court shall remit statutory damages in any case where an infringer believed and had reasonable grounds for believing that his or her use of the copyrighted work was a fair use under section 107, if the infringer was: (i) an employee or agent of a nonprofit educational institution, library, or archives acting within the scope of his or her employment who, or such institution, library, or archives itself, which infringed by reproducing the work in copies or phonorecords; or (ii) a public broadcasting entity which or a person who, as a regular part of the nonprofit activities of a public broadcasting entity (as defined in subsection (g) of section 118) infringed by performing a published nondramatic literary work or by reproducing a transmission program embodying a performance of such a work.

(d)

Additional damages in certain cases. In any case in which the court finds that a defendant proprietor of an establishment who claims as a defense that its activities were exempt under section 110(5) did not have reasonable grounds to believe that its use of a copyrighted work was exempt under such section, the plaintiff shall be entitled to, in addition to any award of damages under this section, an additional award of two times the amount of the license fee that the proprietor of the establishment concerned should have paid the plaintiff for such use during the preceding period of up to 3 years.

77 The defendants clearly met and satisfied the clarity in this statute pursuant to 17 USC section 504 of willful use and applicable jurisdiction of these penalties.

Prayer for relief

Wherefore, Plaintiff requests of this honorable court:

I

Enter Judgments against defendants

II

Order Restitution from defendants

1 On counts 1-6 where as these were deliberate actions against civil rights Plaintiff believes that statutory and exemplary damages of no less then \$10,000,000.

2 On counts 7

A) Plaintiff demands all his DNA, photos, fingerprints, and documentary

(A day in the life of Michael J Hyde) be returned to him.

B) Plaintiff demand that the defective law be repaired to coincide with 18 USC Sec 2511 exemption 2d.

C) All criminal and civil charges dropped permanently from Michael J Hyde's records and repay all out-of-pocket expenses with interest

D) From this day forward that any civil and or criminal action brought against Michael J Hyde in the State of or relating to the State of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth fully furnish Him with to legal representation

3 On count 8 Return any tapes made of any court appearances, State sponsored video(s) etc. to Plaintiff.

4 On Count 9 order restitution in the amount of \$5,000,000 penalty pursuant to USC 18 sec 1832 .The defendants were willful in this violation and so the

Plaintiff also seeks Exemplary Damages for these infringements.

5 On Count 10 order payment for willful damage and illegal use of copyright protected material pursuant to 17USC sec 504 of no less then \$100,000,000 and attorney(s) and expert fees.

Respectfully submitted

Michael J Hyde

148 Brickel Rd

Stoughton, Ma, 02072

Phone # 781-341-4299

Michael J Hyde

8/31/05

ATTENTION

Figure 1

I, Michael J Hyde, am writing this formal letter to let you know that your state agencies have in their possession an office device (voice activated recorder) that is located at the Framingham State Police station. This device is in use at this state agency without compensation to the alleged owner Michael J Hyde. This exercise of the State without compensation is in violation of State Constitution (Article 1, 12 and 14) and United States Constitution (4th and 5th) Amendments just to name a few.

The recorder has been in the states possession since February 15, 2003 and is built up late fees and interest charges. As of now being the date September 4, 2004, the total charges are \$5550.00 US dollars. This breaks down to \$7.50 a day at 566 days plus \$20 overdue charges per month (19 months) plus 20% interest. Be aware that the daily rental fee will increase September 13th to \$10.50 daily with the monthly overdue charges to \$25.00 and interest charges to be set to 21.5%.

It is imperative that this situation receives closure as to alleviate a complex situation from expanding to other legal and vastly more costly avenues. Please feel free to contact me at (home 781 341 4299), (work 617 697 8893) or write to Michael J Hyde at 148 Brickel Rd, Stoughton, MA, 02072

This Attention Letter is intellectual property of Michael J Hyde and is protected by US Code Title 17 and other international treaties relating to intellectual property and is not to be copied or reproduced unless specified by Michael J Hyde.

Thank you for your attention, Michael J Hyde.

WARNING

Figure 2

The use of any and all forms of intellectual property relating to Michael J Hyde is protected under Federal and International Law. Any use of this property without prior consent is in violation of United States Code Title 17 and the Berne Copyright Treaty. This warning is not designed to give amnesty to any entities that has violated these laws and others that are not listed here, this is merely a formal notice letting you know what can happen. It is up to the person(s) or entities that wish to utilize this property to contact its creator, Michael J Hyde. Because of the nature of how this property was taken without permission and with a firearm drawn on it's creator on a Federally funded Interstate Highway, other laws may apply including the RICO STATUTE.

Intellectual property of Michael J Hyde includes any and all representations of his images, sounds, thoughts weather past, present and future. Images include photos, video, medical films, tattoos, DNA, visual costumes or characters, fingerprints, staged performances, in essence all visual data that is identified as Michael J Hyde. Sounds include devices used to make a musical performance and or sound recording, vocal recordings for music, dialog to a live performance, any character created sonically or vocally, documentaries such as A Day In The Life OF Michael J Hyde, in essence all sounds identified as that of Michael J Hyde. Thoughts include all creative concepts abstract and or concrete that are fixed to a tangible format such as a photo, micro cassette, compact disc, electronic storage device, etc.

Michael J Hyde reserves all rights to all forms of intellectual property created by Michael J Hyde unless otherwise specified in writing. Unless otherwise specified to use, copy, or have anything to do with this property be aware that to use this intellectual property, it has a value affixed to it of \$230,000,000 (two hundred thirty million U S dollars) However if this intellectual property is used prior to Michael J Hyde receiving the payment specified with intent to harm and causes injury to Michael J Hyde such as physical, mental, legal or any other detrimental harm to Michael J Hyde, the affixed value will now be \$230,000,000,000 (two hundred thirty billion U S dollars). Michael J Hyde has the right to employ the use of any Federal or International laws that pertain to recovering damages to commercial value of any and all intellectual property. Also Michael J Hyde has the right to incorporate any foreign entities and or persons to file suit in foreign courts including Europe on his behalf. Please note, the U S Supreme has allowed a lawsuit to be filed in U S District Court in the case of Austria v Altmann which deals with intellectual property stated over \$100 million dollars. This legal road is a two way street in which many countries may want to travel and the intellectual property of Michael J Hyde may be a fine vehicle for Europe to travel on.

If the cost of the property seems expensive in excess in which you are willing to spend, then it is suggested that you cease and desist from use and possession of this property. Furthermore the application may seem selective but it is not intended that way and is no excuse to violate copyright laws that protect the property of Michael J Hyde.

WARNING NOTICE

FIGURE 3

Any and all persons and or entities that wish to use my services or products must pay up front. This includes all DNA, photographs, fingerprints, and or any related documentation related to Michael J Hyde. This notice is a formal warning that cannot be signed away unless payment is received in full to Michael J Hyde. The State of Massachusetts and persons acting as its officers and or employees have stated a demand for my DNA, finger prints and other products of Michael J Hyde as a State Court order that seem to be in violation of State law, the State Constitution, Federal Law, the US Constitution and International Law.

Due to the fact that Michael J Hyde is a manufacturing plant of his DNA, fingerprints, and other created identifiable concepts and or products of Michael J Hyde, this would be a violation of Patient Law as well as a violation of TRADE SECRETS. Entities that are employed by the State and use my tax dollars as payment are my employees and by my rights as the legal guardian of myself, shell not receive freely any products, DNA. Any disclosure forced by the State of Massachusetts would be viewed as a violation of Patent infringement and a violation of TRADE SECRETS in Federal Court and other Courts across the globe.

The State Court has made a troubling demand for my products. By demanding my DNA and or finger prints, my 4th, 5th, and 13th US Constitutional Amendments to name just a few are violated. The State has demanded that I, against my freewill and under duress due to a State law that violates other Federal and International laws as well as the State and Federal Constitutional provisions, I must submit a DNA sample to the State Government of Massachusetts by FEB 18, 2005. As for property taken for public use, I see compensation to the amount of \$1,000,000,000 [one billion US dollars] before FEB 18, 2005 or \$1,000,000,000,000 [one trillion US dollars] after FEB 18, 2005. This figure is doubled due to the violation of the TRADE SECRETS and Patent Law violations. This figure can be negotiated but its up to the State of Massachusetts to call out to me with no direct or indirect threats to myself or finances, incarceration or any other State retaliatory activities. Any agreement that are and will be signed that do not benefit Michael J Hyde and or designed to protect the State from any legal, Constitutional, or financial responsibility shall be deemed as signed under duress and shell not be considered legally binding.

Thank you for your time in this matter. I do hope to here from you in the near future, before Feb 18, 2005. Contact me at 148 Brickel Rd, Stoughton, MA 02072 or call at 781-341-4299. Thank you. Michael J Hyde.